Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP)
Outcome Monitoring Program (OMP) Implementation Workgroup (IWG) Meeting
SUMMARY
Friday, July 8, 2005
1:30 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.

Participants

ADP Staff:

Laura Colson
Sue Cote
Mahnaz Dashti
Carmen Delgado
Ann Drolette
George Lembi
Marjorie McKisson
Jon Meltzer
Rachelle Repace
Edith Thacher
Alice Van Ommeren

External Participants:

Tom Avey
Susan Bauer
Deseree Crevecoer
Gino Giannavola
David Hoang
Tim Kendall
Jason Kletter
Sue McVean
Ken Nyberg
Joel Phillips
Al Rodriguez
Nancy Young

1. **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review – Carmen Delgado**

Carmen opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda with the members.

2. **Treatment Update**

A. Regional Meetings – Ann Drolette

Ann Drolette provided an update on the regional trainings the ADP CalOMS team provided in Sacramento, Santa Rosa, San Diego, and Redding in June. Representatives from 52 counties attended these trainings. A follow-up meeting will be held via Office Live Meeting in July for counties and direct providers unable to attend the regional trainings.

B. Data File Instructions and Data Dictionary – Carmen Delgado

Carmen announced the CalOMS Data File Input Instructions and Data Dictionary documents were distributed via email to counties and direct providers two weeks ago for review and comment. Comments are due back from counties and direct providers by July 8, 2005. Suggested revisions will be made next week (July 11 – 15, 2005) and posted to the ADP website. Note: for security reasons the CalOMS Data File Input Instructions document will only be available via email.

C.   CalOMS System Change Process – Sue Cote

Sue Cote provided an overview of ADP's proposed process for making changes to the CalOMS data collection system. ADP is cognizant that once the CalOMS system is up and running necessary changes will be identified and thus a process will need to be in place for reviewing, approving, and processing such changes. Essentially, ADP needs to document this proposed process so as to:

- Assure the CalOMS system is capable of adhering to the CalOMS project goals
- Allow for creativity and flexibility in the system
- Keep stakeholders and ADP aware of the CalOMS system design
- Mitigate escalation of costs

D.   Data Submission Errors – Carmen Delgado, Marjorie McKisson, Sue Cote

For CalOMS there will be two levels of errors: 1. fatal errors, which will result in the rejection of the entire record should a field identified as fatal contain an error or is empty/incomplete; and 2. critical errors, which will result in generation of an error report to the submitting party alerting them of the critical fields which contain errors while allowing the remaining fields (so long as they contain no fatal errors) to be accepted into the CalOMS database. Sue Cote presented the background that led to the decision to allow only these two levels of error in CalOMS.

Discussion followed Sue's presentation. Essentially, the conference call participants agree the objective is to improve the accuracy of data as much as possible. The group agreed that no data containing errors or incomplete/empty fields should be accepted in CalOMS. The group acknowledged that there needs to be a period of time to allow counties and direct providers to work out bugs within their systems and become acclimated to the new data collection system and business practices. Further, the group agreed counties and direct providers will ultimately be responsible for the quality, completeness, and integrity of the data they submit to ADP. The goal agreed upon is for all counties and direct contract providers to submit 100% clean data one year from the CalOMS implementation date.

There was also discussion surrounding incentives to ensure compliance with CalOMS data quality standards. One incentive proposed was to ensure counties and providers get information/data on their clients back. There was also discussion about data audits.

E.   Regional Providers – Marjorie McKisson

This discussion surrounded providers that have regional agreements with multiple counties as well as counties that refer clients to neighboring counties to provide services. The issue for the former situation is related to reporting; does the provider submit data to all the counties they have sites in and if so, do they have to several systems to do so. The issue for the latter situation pertains to funding and allocations; if the referring county pays for the services provided in the county they refer a client to, how do they get the credit? ADP needs to clarify its internal processes related to these issues to see if such processes reflect reality.

In addition, there was discussion about the various situations related to regional providers and county referrals. Some discussion occurred about possible solutions, such as collecting/identifying client county of origin. Further analysis will be conducted to identify alternative solutions to the aforementioned situations.

3. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for August 12, 2005, from 1:30 – 3:30 PM and will be held via conference call.